

### **REMARKS**

The following amendments and remarks are submitted to be fully responsive to the non-final Official Action of **June 16, 2006**. In the present amendment, claims 1-11 are cancelled and claims 12-22 are added. No new matter is introduced (see, e.g., ¶¶ 0003, 0004, 0011, 0021, 0022, 0024-0033, 0036, 0037, and 0041-0046, and FIGs. 1, element 5a, of Applicants' published Specification). Thus, claims 12-22 are now pending. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

The present independent claim 12, and the claims dependent therefrom, are patently distinguishable over *Trytko* (USP 5,231,499) and *Barnett et al.* (USP 5,408,272), because *Trytko* and *Barnett et al.*, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest all of the features recited in the claims. For example, independent claim 12 (emphasis added ) recites:

A video production switcher, comprising;  
**an integrated digital video effects processor** having processing elements,  
one or more keyers;  
one or more mixers;  
one or more effects devices; and  
routing elements,  
**wherein the digital video effects processor has a dedicated connection from the keyers, the mixers, the effects devices, and the routing elements to the processing elements of the digital video effects processor.**

Advantageously, the invention of independent claim 12 and claims dependent therefrom improves on the prior art in the following ways:

(1) The DVE is integrated into the switcher. This can provide space, power and cost savings to the combined unit versus the separate(2 pieces of equipment.

(2) The DVE is integrated into the switcher, with dedicated video routing paths. This means that Aux busses and video inputs are no longer consumed to send and receive video with the DVE.

(3) The Switcher provides dedicated keyers for compositing the DVE effect. This means the MLE Keyers are no longer consumed to layer in DVE effects.

(4) A single controller (microprocessor) controls both the DVE and the Switcher. This improves the prior art by allowing simple, synchronized control of switcher and DVE effects. This also allows for a unified control user interface for both Switcher and DVE, where the prior art requires 2 separate and different user interfaces.

By contrast, the prior art, such as *Trytko*, discloses a switcher with multiple keyers, MLEs, etc, wherein advanced Digital Video Effects are performed by an external piece of equipment, generally known as a "DVE" (Digital Video Effects). This is generally interfaced by routing video from the switcher via Aux Busses and returning them into the switcher, via its video inputs, and compositing them with one of an MLE's keyers. Control of the DVE is independent of the switcher, often requiring more than one operator to synchronize effects on the switcher with effects on the DVE. Specifically, *Trytko* describes a Video Production Switcher, including multi-level transparent compositing with one or several keyers, and optionally cascaded multi-level effects units to provide greater number of keyers, allowing larger numbers of composited layers. However, *Trytko* is silent with respect to the noted features and advantages of the invention recited in independent claim 12.

*Barnett et al.* fails to cure the noted deficiencies in *Trytko*, and *Trytko* and *Barnett et al.*, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest all of the features recited in independent claim 12. Specifically, although *Barnett et al.* may disclose use of external equipment for achieving advanced digital effects, and sending a portion of the layered video to such an apparatus, including a cascaded processing approach, like *Trytko*, *Barnett et al.* also is silent with respect to the noted features and advantages of the invention recited in independent claim 12.

Accordingly, *Trytko* and *Barnett et al.*, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the above and the noted features, as recited in independent claims 1 and 27.

The dependent claims are allowable over *Trytko* and *Barnett et al.*, taken alone or in combination, on their on merits and for at least the reasons as argued above with respect to independent claim 12.

The references that have been cited, but not applied by the Examiner, have been taken into consideration during formulation of this response. However, since these references were not considered by the Examiner to be of sufficient relevance to apply against any of the claims, no detailed comments thereon is believed to be warranted at this time.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite the prosecution and engage in a joint effort to work out a mutually satisfactory solution.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON PEABODY, LLP**

/Carlos R. Villamar, Reg. # 43,224/

Carlos R. Villamar

Reg. No. 43,224

**NIXON PEABODY LLP**

CUSTOMER NO.: 22204

401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900

Washington, DC 20004

Tel: 202-585-8000

Fax: 202-585-8080